

Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before Sept. 1, 1995.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of August, 1995.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-20124 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

Work Group on Real Estate Investment, Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefits Plan; Meeting

Pursuant to the authority contained in Section 512 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. 1142, a public meeting of the Work Group of the Real Estate Investment of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans will be held on Sept. 12, 1995, in Room S-3215 A&B, U.S. Department of Labor Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210.

The purpose of the meeting, which will begin at 1:00 p.m. is to concentrate on the regulatory issues that impact on real estate investments for pension funds and to hear witnesses addressing this topic.

Members of the public are encouraged to file a written statement pertaining to any topic concerning ERISA by submitting 20 copies on or before Sept. 1, 1995 to Linda Jackson, Acting Executive Secretary, ERISA Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Labor, Suite N-5677, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20210. Individuals or representatives of organizations wishing to address the advisory Council should forward their request to the Executive Secretary or telephone (202) 219-8753. Oral presentations will be limited to ten minutes, but an extended statement may be submitted for the record.

Organizations or individuals may also submit statements for the record without testifying. Twenty (20) copies of such statements should be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before Sept. 1, 1995.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of August, 1995.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-20125 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

Work Group on Defined Contribution Adequacy, Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefits Plan; Meeting

Pursuant to the authority contained in Section 512 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA), 29 U.S.C. 1142, public meetings of the Work Group on Defined Contribution Adequacy of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans will be held on Sept. 11 and 13, 1995, in Room S-3215 A-B, U.S. Department of Labor Building, Third and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210.

The purpose of the meetings, which will begin at 9:30 a.m. each day, is to hear more testimony relating to various policy issues surrounding retirement income adequacy.

Members of the public are encouraged to file a written statement pertaining to any topic concerning ERISA by submitting 20 copies on or before Sept. 1, 1995 to Linda Jackson, Acting Executive Secretary, ERISA Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Labor, Suite N-5677, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20210. Individuals or representatives of organizations wishing to address the Advisory Council should forward their request to the Executive Secretary or telephone (202) 219-8753. Oral presentations will be limited to ten minutes, but an extended statement may be submitted for the record.

Organizations or individuals may also submit statements for the record without testifying. Twenty (20) copies of such statements should be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Advisory Council at the above address. Papers will be accepted and included in the record of the meeting if received on or before Sept. 1, 1995.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of August 1995.

Olena Berg,

Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-20126 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-29-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Applications for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has

granted the request of Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (the licensee) to withdraw its July 31, 1992 and January 29, 1993, applications for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License No. DPR-61 for the Haddam Neck Plant, located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

The proposed amendments would have revised the plugging criteria for the steam generator tubes due to cracking in the tubesheet expansion roll transition area.

The Commission had previously issued Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on September 1, 1992 (57 FR 39709) and March 4, 1993 (58 FR 12379). However, by letter dated July 25, 1995, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated July 31, 1992, and January 29, 1993, and the licensee's letter dated July 25, 1995, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06457.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Alan B. Wang,

Project Manager, Project Directorate I-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-20118 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket Nos. 50-327 and 328]

Sequoyah Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79 issued to the Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee) for operation of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, located in Soddy Daisy, Tennessee.

The proposed amendment would revise the numerical values for the overtemperature and overpower delta-temperature equation constants in Technical Specification (TS) Table 2.2-

1, Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Trip Setpoints. The original proposed change, published in the **Federal Register** April 26, 1995 (60 FR 20527), would have moved these values from the TS to the Core Operating Limit Report.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

TVA has evaluated the proposed technical specification (TS) change and has determined that it does not represent a significant hazards consideration based on criteria established in 10 CFR 50.92(c). Operation of Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN) in accordance with the proposed amendment will not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The revision of the $[\tau]_4$ constant numerical value in the overtemperature delta temperature (OT $[\delta]T$) and overpower delta temperature (OP $[\delta]T$) equations have been analyzed by the [* * *] Westinghouse Electric Corporation evaluation and have been found to have sufficient margin for the proposed change. This evaluation shows that the proposed changes are bounded by the existing analysis for Chapter 6 and 15 accidents. The setpoint change will continue to meet the applicable safety analysis acceptance criteria for the transients evaluated. The offsite dose rates for postulated accidents have not exceeded the values stated in the Updated Final Safety

Analysis Report as a result of this change. The clarification of the equality signs for the constant numerical values does not change plant or accident mitigation functions. Therefore, the proposed changes will not increase the consequences of an accident.

This change affects the OT $[\delta]T$ and OP $[\delta]T$ functions that are designed to mitigate the consequences of an accident and are not considered to be an accident initiating source. Therefore, the probability of an accident is not increased by the proposed change.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The revision of lead/lag dynamic compensation for the OT $[\delta]T$ and OP $[\delta]T$ functions do not impact accident initiators because these functions are used for accident mitigation and are not postulated as a source. Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident is not created by the proposed revision.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed revision to the lead/lag compensation for the OT $[\delta]T$ and OP $[\delta]T$ functions does not invalidate the conclusions in the safety analysis. Margins provided for in the safety analysis are maintained with the proposed changes such that no reduction in the margin of safety is involved.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By September 14, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's

property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the

Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Frederick J. Hebdon: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to General Council, Tennessee Valley Authority, ET 11H, 400 West Summit Hill Drive, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 6, 1995, which was superseded by the application dated August 7, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the local public document room located at the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Library, 1101 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David E. LaBarge,

Sr. Project Manager, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-20119 Filed 8-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. STN 50-530]

Arizona Public Service Company, et al.; Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 3; Environmental Assessment and Finding of no Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), Type A Tests, to the Arizona Public Service Company, et al. (APS or the licensee), for operation of the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS), Unit No. 3, located in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), on a one-time schedular extension which would permit rescheduling the second containment integrated leak rate test (ILRT) in the first 10-year service period from the fifth refueling outage (3R5) currently scheduled for November 1995 to the sixth refueling outage (3R6) planned for April 1997.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated June 21, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The current ILRT requirements for PVNGS, Unit 3, as set forth in Appendix J, are that, after the pre-operational leak rate test, a set of three Type A tests must be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year period. Also, the third test of each set must be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year plant inservice inspection (ISI). The first periodic Type A test was performed in May of 1991 during the second refueling outage in Unit 3 (3R2), 40 months from the date of Unit 3 commercial operation. The second periodic test is currently scheduled to be performed in November of 1995 during the fifth refueling outage (3R5), corresponding to an interval of 54 months. The third Type A test is currently planned to be performed during the seventh refueling outage